

**To:** Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** BudneySL@cdm.com[BudneySL@cdm.com]; Willard Potter" [otto@demaximis.com];  
ay Basso/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; Sarah Flanagan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; Patricia  
Hick/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; [Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@usace.army.mil]; arah  
Flanagan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; Patricia  
Hick/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; [Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@usace.army.mil]; atricia  
Hick/R2/USEPA/US@EPA; [Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@usace.army.mil];  
Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@usace.army.mil>; "Mike Barbara" [mab.consulting@verizon.net]; Mike  
Barbara" [mab.consulting@verizon.net]  
**From:** "Robert Law"  
**Sent:** Fri 8/31/2012 1:52:26 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Comments, RM 10.9 RDWP and BODR....

Thank you.

>>> Stephanie Vaughn <Vaughn.Stephannie@epamail.epa.gov> 8/31/2012 9:49 AM >>>

Thanks, Rob. The purpose of the comment was simply to add a statement to the work plan, and future versions of the design, explaining the difference.

Also note, I accidentally accepted all of the redline/strikeout in the comments I sent on the chapter 2 tables of the BODR. I'll send you the correct version on Tuesday.

I'm away for the weekend -- have a great one, and I'll speak to you on Tuesday. I'll probably check my email later today too in case anything comes up.

Thanks,  
Stephanie

-----"Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com> wrote: -----

=====

To: Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: "Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com>  
Date: 08/30/2012 09:53PM  
Cc: <BudneySL@cdm.com>, "Willard Potter" <otto@demaximis.com>, Ray Basso/R2/USEPA/US@EPA,  
Sarah Flanagan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Patricia Hick/R2/USEPA/US@EPA,  
<Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@usace.army.mil>, "Mike Barbara" <mab.consulting@verizon.net>  
Subject: Re: Comments, RM 10.9 RDWP and BODR....

=====

Stephanie

As an initial response to BODR Specific Comment 1 and RAWP Specific Comment 2. The documents reflect the additional area between the Removal Area and SSP 481. The CPG's August 1 letter stated that the CPG would include the additional area and that the BODR and RAWP would reflect that change from the RM 10.9 AOC and SOW.

R/  
Rob

Robert Law, Ph.D.  
de maximis, inc.

rlaw@demaximis.com

Voice: 908-735-9315

Fax: 908-735-2132>>> Stephanie Vaughn <Vaughn.Stephannie@epamail.epa.gov> 8/30/2012 3:53 PM >>>

Hi Rob,

Attached are comments on the Removal Design Work Plan and Basis of Design Report for the RM 10.9 Time Critical Removal Action, which were submitted for EPA review on August 2, 2012.

Since the RDWP is a draft final document, please incorporate the comments and submit a revised version for approval.

However, since the BODR is a preliminary design report, changes required by the comments can generally be incorporated into the next submittal, the pre-final, 90% design document. Note that since this is only a 30% design, and much more detail is needed in most areas of the report than has already been provided, additional comments on the 90% document will certainly be made, including, most likely, on areas that have already been commented upon.

As we have discussed, in order for this project to move forward in a timely manner, frequent and open communication between EPA and the CPG on several issues of concern will be needed. These issues will likely change as the project progresses. At this time, the following comments on the BODR are those that EPA thinks are of the highest priority, and which we would like to discuss with you as soon as possible:

Comments 2, 3, 15, 25 and 27, 31, 40, 54a, and 59.

Of course, if there are additional topics you would like to discuss, please let us know, and we will raise additional concerns as they arise. We may want to consider setting up a regular, perhaps weekly, call to review the status of the project and keep track of outstanding items. We can discuss that idea further next week.

Also keep in mind that comments will likely come in from other groups, including the Township of Lyndhurst. Any additional comments received on the BODR and/or RDWP will be forwarded for review/discussion.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,  
Stephanie  
212-637-3914

[attachment(s) 20120801 RM 10-9 Removal Action Add Area.pdf removed by Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US]

-----"Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com> wrote: -----

=====

To: Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US@EPA

From: "Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com>

Date: 08/30/2012 09:53PM

Cc: <BudneySL@cdm.com>, "Willard Potter" <otto@demaximis.com>, Ray Basso/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Sarah Flanagan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Patricia Hick/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, <Elizabeth.A.Buckrucker@usace.army.mil>, "Mike Barbara" <mab.consulting@verizon.net>

Subject: Re: Comments, RM 10.9 RDWP and BODR....

=====

Stephanie

As an initial response to BODR Specific Comment 1 and RAWP Specific Comment 2. The documents reflect the additional area between the Removal Area and SSP 481. The CPG's August 1 letter stated that the CPG would include the additional area and that the BODR and RAWP would reflect that change from the RM 10.9 AOC and SOW.

R/  
Rob

Robert Law, Ph.D.  
de maximis, inc.  
rlaw@demaximis.com

Voice: 908-735-9315

Fax: 908-735-2132>>> Stephanie Vaughn <Vaughn.Stephanie@epamail.epa.gov> 8/30/2012 3:53 PM >>>

Hi Rob,

Attached are comments on the Removal Design Work Plan and Basis of Design Report for the RM 10.9 Time Critical Removal Action, which were submitted for EPA review on August 2, 2012.

Since the RDWP is a draft final document, please incorporate the comments and submit a revised version for approval.

However, since the BODR is a preliminary design report, changes required by the comments can generally be incorporated into the next submittal, the pre-final, 90% design document. Note that since this is only a 30% design, and much more detail is needed in most areas of the report than has already been provided, additional comments on the 90% document will certainly be made, including, most likely, on areas that have already been commented upon.

As we have discussed, in order for this project to move forward in a timely manner, frequent and open communication between EPA and the CPG on several issues of concern will be needed. These issues will likely change as the project progresses. At this time, the following comments on the BODR are those that EPA thinks are of the highest priority, and which we would like to discuss with you as soon as possible:

Comments 2, 3, 15, 25 and 27, 31, 40, 54a, and 59.

Of course, if there are additional topics you would like to discuss, please let us know, and we will raise additional concerns as they arise. We may want to consider setting up a regular, perhaps weekly, call to review the status of the project and keep track of outstanding items. We can discuss that idea further next week.

Also keep in mind that comments will likely come in from other groups, including the Township of Lyndhurst. Any additional comments received on the BODR and/or RDWP will be forwarded for review/discussion.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,  
Stephanie  
212-637-3914

[attachment(s) 20120801 RM 10-9 Removal Action Add Area.pdf removed by Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US]